

Alexander Henderson's *Snow and Flood after Great Storms of 1869*

David Harris

Volume 16, Number 2, 1989

Études sur l'architecture et son environnement
Studies on Architecture and its Environment

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1073146ar>
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1073146ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

UAAC-AAUC (University Art Association of Canada | Association d'art des universités du Canada)

ISSN

0315-9906 (print)
1918-4778 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Harris, D. (1989). Alexander Henderson's *Snow and Flood after Great Storms of 1869*. *RACAR : Revue d'art canadienne / Canadian Art Review*, 16(2), 155–160.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/1073146ar>

Article abstract

Il n'y a pas si longtemps encore, la photographie était considérée comme une forme d'expression essentiellement documentaire. Cette foi envers l'exactitude et la fidélité du médium emprisonnait l'image photographique dans un rôle marginal de témoin de la réalité à l'appui de l'étude de l'architecture et complément de l'histoire écrite.

Si, dans le passé, on accordait à la photographie une valeur objective, absente de toute analyse, ce jugement est aujourd'hui réévalué par les historiens. Au même titre que les autres formes de représentation, il appert que la photographie, produit culturel créé en réponse à des besoins sociaux et commerciaux, est matière à interprétation.

Pour illustrer cette théorie, nous verrons, après un survol de l'histoire et de l'utilisation des photographies documentaires, comment, à travers un album intitulé *Snow and Flood after Great Storms of 1869*, un photographe commercial montréalais, Alexander Henderson, a perçu, choisi et présenté les événements associés à ce désastre naturel. Le but de l'article veut ainsi démontrer que seule une connaissance du contexte entourant le moment de la création, permet une appréciation juste et une utilisation adéquate de la photographie comme manifestation d'évidence.

Alexander Henderson's Snow and Flood after Great Storms of 1869

DAVID HARRIS*

Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture

RÉSUMÉ

Il n'y a pas si longtemps encore, la photographie était considérée comme une forme d'expression essentiellement documentaire. Cette foi envers l'exactitude et la fidélité du médium emprisonnait l'image photographique dans un rôle marginal de témoin de la réalité à l'appui de l'étude de l'architecture et complément de l'histoire écrite.

Si, dans le passé, on accordait à la photographie une valeur objective, absente de toute analyse, ce jugement est aujourd'hui réévalué par les historiens. Au même titre que les autres formes de représentation, il appert que la photographie, produit culturel créé en réponse à des besoins sociaux et commerciaux, est matière à interprétation.

Pour illustrer cette théorie, nous verrons, après un survol de l'histoire et de l'utilisation des photographies documentaires, comment, à travers un album intitulé *Snow and Flood after Great Storms of 1869*, un photographe commercial montréalais, Alexander Henderson, a perçu, choisi et présenté les événements associés à ce désastre naturel. Le but de l'article veut ainsi démontrer que seule une connaissance du contexte entourant le moment de la création, permet une appréciation juste et une utilisation adéquate de la photographie comme manifestation d'évidence.

PHOTOGRAPHS AS DOCUMENTS/ DOCUMENTARY PHOTOGRAPHY

After 150 years, it is still common to find photographs referred to as documents. In their ability to provide detailed, precise, "objective" information, they seem ideally suited to the recording and study of architecture. This belief rests upon the apparently unshakable conviction that in both pictorial and cultural senses, the camera provides an unmediated record of an individual building or an entire cityscape.

Such a belief was present at the outset of photography in 1839 and is found fully expressed in William Henry Fox Talbot's 1844-46 book *The Pencil of Nature*. In his commentary to plate XIII,

* I am grateful to Stanley Triggs, Curator of the Notman Archives, McCord Museum, Louise Guay, National Archives of Canada, and David Miller for sharing their extensive knowledge of Henderson; to Rosemary Haddad, Canadian Centre for Architecture, for bibliographic advice on the album; and especially to Louise Déry, Canadian Centre for Architecture, who undertook much of the research on Henderson's album on which this article is based.

"Queen's College, Oxford, Entrance Gateway," Talbot wrote in part:

In examining photographic pictures of a certain degree of perfection, the use of a large lens is recommended, such as elderly persons frequently employ in reading. This magnifies the objects two or three times, and often discloses a multitude of minute details, which were previously unobserved and unsuspected. It frequently happens, moreover—and this is one of the charms of photography—that the operator himself discovers on examination, perhaps long afterwards, that he has depicted many things he had no notion of at the time. Sometimes inscriptions and dates are found upon the buildings, or printed placards most irrelevant, are discovered upon their walls: sometimes a distant dial-plate is seen, and upon it—unconsciously recorded—the hour of the day at which the view was taken.

This passage has been quoted at length since it summarizes the belief and all of the arguments that will support the use of photographs as documentary evidence.

Implicit in Talbot's text is the idea that in the activity of taking a photograph, it is the camera that records the subject, casting the photographer,

to some extent, into the role of witness rather than creator.¹ The amount of visual information recorded by the camera far exceeded what the photographer could have seen and understood while taking the picture.² Although not fully developed here, Talbot's argument rested upon the simple, but to the nineteenth-century mind nevertheless firm, conviction that a mechanical recording device necessarily provided reliable, "objective" information, while that found in a hand-drawn image was both fallible and represented a "subjective" interpretation.³

In the act of returning to the photograph, whether by the photographer or by another person, Talbot predicted the role that later historians would assume in their search for information. The implied metaphor of a photograph as a window through which one views the past and the use of a magnifying glass as a device to penetrate this space encouraged the illusion that photographs are different from hand-drawn images. The seemingly insignificant details that Talbot seizes upon—minute descriptions, the face of a clock—suggest that the amount of visual information in a photograph is virtually inexhaustible.

Not surprisingly, the assumptions and ideas expressed in this passage were repeated throughout the nineteenth century. To take one instance, the amateur photographer Lord Robert Cecil (1830-1903), later Lord Salisbury and Prime Minister of Great Britain wrote in 1864:

[Photography] has furnished to mankind a new kind of vision that can penetrate into the distant or the past—a retina, as faithful as that of the natural eye, but whose impressions do not perish with the wave of light that gave them birth. Photographs regarded as evidence of that which they represent, differ in essence from any other species of representation that has ever been attempted. They are free, so far as their outlines are

concerned, from the deceptive and therefore vitiating element of human agency.⁴

In numerous publications, photographs were and continue to be valued for these reasons.⁵ However, writers have recently begun to re-examine the underlying premises of this attitude and to revise them in light of a larger debate over the practice and ideology of "documentary" photography.

In a series of articles, Joel Snyder has investigated why photographs are still thought of as unmediated, "natural" records that are fundamentally different from all other forms of visual representation. In Snyder's view, such a belief (as is evident in Talbot's and Cecil's texts) has always rested upon what the camera seemed to guarantee about the recorded information. In cultural terms, the camera answered a desire for scientifically verifiable visual information. However, by carefully analyzing the photographer's working practice from the initial choice and framing of a subject, through the exposure of the negative to the final printing and presentation of the photograph, Snyder reveals how the photographer makes a series of conscious decisions that result in a cultural interpretation rather than the simple recording of the subject.⁶ In a parallel investigation, Snyder has examined how the design of camera obscura, the predecessor of the photographic camera, was made to conform to the conventions of the one-point perspective in accordance with prevailing visual values.⁷ While not denying that the camera is capable of recording an enormous amount of visual information, Snyder argues that cameras do not inevitably or automatically do so; all the decisions rest with the photographer, and photographs, as images, conform to prevailing pictorial conventions and values.⁸

Simultaneously with Snyder's research, other critics began to examine the ideology behind the

1 In an earlier letter published in the *Literary Gazette* of 2 February 1839, Talbot explicitly made this point: "From all [prior drawing devices] the present invention differs totally in this respect (which may be explained in a single sentence), viz. that, by means of this contrivance, it is not the artist who makes the picture, but the picture which makes ITSELF. All that the artist does is to dispose the apparatus before the object whose image he requires; he then leaves it for a certain length of time, greater or lesser, according to circumstances. At the end of the time he returns, takes out his picture, and finds it finished." See Gail Buckland, *Fox Talbot and the Invention of Photography* (Boston, 1980), 43. See also Talbot's commentary to plate III in *The Pencil of Nature* (London, 1844-46).

2 See the commentaries to plates II and X in Talbot, *Pencil*.

3 Although Talbot was fully aware of the technical limitations of photography in, for example, successfully recording movement and colours, this does not seem to have affected his argument. See his commentaries to plates IV and XIV in Talbot, *Pencil*.

4 "Photography," *Quarterly Review*, CXVI (1864), 482-83. See also 498-99.

5 See, for example, Oliver Wendell Holmes, "The Stereoscope and the Stereograph," *Atlantic Monthly*, III (June 1859); rpt. in Beaumont Newhall, ed., *Photography: Essays & Images* (New York, 1980), 58; Walter Rundell, Jr., *Early Texas Oil: A Photographic History 1836-1966* (College Station, Texas, 1978); and Robert A. Weinstein and Larry Booth, *Collection, Use, and Care of Historical Photographs* (Nashville, 1977), 36-37.

6 Joel Snyder and Neil Walsh Allen, "Photography, Vision, and Representation," *Critical Inquiry*, II (1975), 143-69.

7 Joel Snyder, "Picturing Vision," *Critical Inquiry*, VI (1980), 499-526.

8 See Joel Snyder, "Documentary without Ontology," *Studies in Visual Communication*, X (1984), 78-95, and his "Inventing Photography, 1839-1879," in Sarah Greenough, Joel Snyder, David Travis, and Colin Westerbeck, *On the Art of Fixing a Shadow: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Photography*, ex. cat. (National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1989), 3-9.

practice of “documentary photography.” This phrase first appeared in the 1930s to describe a practice (as well as a growing body of work) that strove not merely to inform in the sense of providing information but also to shape opinion through the selection and presentation of this information.⁹ It became associated, at least in the United States, with the depiction of the social conditions of the poor and socially disenfranchised. The term was then applied retrospectively to a disparate group of nineteenth- and twentieth-century photographs—some taken for purely commercial reasons, some as personal crusades against social injustices or economic exploitation, some as part of government-sponsored commissions—in an effort to construct a continuous history¹⁰ that would sustain a current practice of photography.¹¹

This tradition of “documentary photography” has been re-evaluated along two related lines. First, research into the particular bodies of work that have been considered “documentary” in their intentions have revealed how discontinuous and complex this tradition, in fact, is. It has become increasingly apparent that photography, as a social and often commercial practice, reflected the cultural values of the photographer and, in the case of commissioned or commercially motivated work, those of his or her patrons or intended market.¹² Second, those photographers concerned with social and political issues have sought ways to understand and acknowledge the ideology latent in their own photographic work so that a now seemingly discredited practice can be revitalized.¹³

The recent trend in research has been to consider photographs as typical artifacts of their time, created for and addressed to particular audiences.

9 See William Stott, *Documentary Expression and Thirties America* (New York, 1973), and Maren Stange, *Symbols of Ideal Life: Social Documentary Photography in America 1890-1950* (Cambridge, England, 1989), 89-131.

10 See, for example, Gail Buckland, *Reality Recorded: Early Documentary Photography* (Greenwich, Connecticut, 1974), or Naomi Rosenblum, *A World History of Photography* (New York, 1984), 154-91 and 340-83.

11 See, for example, Beaumont Newhall, “Documentary Approach to Photography,” *Parnassus*, x (1938), 3-6, or Roy Stryker, “Documentary Photography,” *The Complete Photographer*, iv (1942), 1364-74.

12 See Sam Walker, “Documentary Photography in America: The Political Dimensions of an Art Form,” *Radical America* (1977), 53-66. For a recent summary of the issues involved, see Abigail Solomon-Godeau, “Who Is Speaking Thus? Some Questions About Documentary Photography,” in Lorne Falk and Barbara Fischer, eds., *The Event Horizon: Essays on Hope, Sexuality, Social Space and Media(tion) in Art* (Toronto and Banff, 1987), 193-214.

13 See, for example, Su Braden, *Committing Photography* (London, 1983), or Sylvia Harvey, “Who Wants to Know What and Why? Some Problems for Documentary in the 80s,” *Ten*, 8, xxiii (1987), 26-31.

The sense of “photographs as documents” has consequently been enlarged to include not only the information found within the photographs but also the photographs themselves.

SNOW AND FLOOD AFTER GREAT STORMS OF 1869

The purpose of the present article is to examine an album in the Photographs Collection of the CCA in light of current discussions of documentary photography. *Snow and Flood after Great Storms of 1869* by Alexander Henderson (1831-1913) is an octavo album containing a printed title page with a list of contents and 18 mounted photographs. The photographs depict a number of Montréal streets after the enormous snowfalls of March 1869 and under water following the subsequent spring run-off in April (Figs. 175 to 178, 180, 183).¹⁴

While the individual photographs contain an enormous amount of the type of incidental information that Talbot envisioned the architectural or social historian discovering, the importance of the album as a form of cultural documentation lies in its relationship with the larger social and commercial world in which Henderson lived and worked. In effect, to categorize the album as “documentary” implies an understanding of the social and commercial dimensions of photography in the late 1860s.

DOCUMENTATION AND EVENTS

Our knowledge of the events of 1869 that initially provided Henderson with his subject matter is now both indirect and incomplete. In any attempt to reconstruct, even partially, past events from this album, the historian must begin by acknowledging that Henderson, in producing and marketing this album, had to select, interpret, and order them.

The limitations in Henderson’s coverage are temporal, geographical, and social. From the events that occurred over a two-month period, Henderson has restricted himself to two relatively brief periods of time. Through a comparison with other dated photographs and from information found in newspaper accounts, it would appear that Henderson made his snow photographs from 7-15 March and the flood ones on 22 April 1869.¹⁵

14 The publication is described in Appendix A. In addition to the copy in the collection of the Centre Canadien d’Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture, there are copies in the Notman Photographic Archives, McCord Museum, the Bibliothèque des sciences sociales, Université de Montréal, and the Salle Gagnon, Bibliothèque Municipale de Montréal. The title page, number, and sequence of photographs are identical in each copy; slight variations exist in the cropping of individual photographs.

15 This dating is based on the printed inscriptions on the verso

The photographs show views of some of the prominent commercial and residential streets in the city, while entire areas such as Bonsecours Station, St. Ann's Market, and Griffintown are not shown at all. Finally, in their sequence, the photographs impose a control and order on the succession of disruptive and destructive natural events. The album opens with a photograph of a train engine with a snow plough (plate 1; Fig. 174), an image symbolizing the successful maintenance of communications with the outside world. The following 13 photographs (plates 2-14; Figs. 175, 176, 178, and 180) reveal the generally tidy aftermath of the snowstorms, with snow piled in the centre of the streets to form a roadbed for sleighs. In the final four photographs (plates 15-18; Figs. 177 and 183), individuals and groups are shown posing for the photographer, scattered about in boats and on makeshift planks in the partially submerged streets. The photographs consistently show the triumph of adaptation and ingenuity, implying that despite the severity of the snowfalls and the flooding, the city was able to cope successfully with the effects of a natural disaster.

The limits of this point of view—in effect a single reading of the events—become evident if one examines other accounts of these same events. In an article in *The Gazette* of 20 April 1869, some of the severe economic and social consequences are touched upon:

No doubt immense damage has been done. The cellars in St. Paul street are filled, from four to six feet deep. In some places, water is within a foot of the street floor. This year no person anticipated a flood and no preparations were made for it. . . . Cellars of nearly all houses in Griwintown [*sic*] are filled; families have retired to upper stories; and numerous anxious faces were peering out of windows upon the rising, rushing waters.¹⁶

Three days later, on 23 April, the day after Henderson is thought to have made his negatives, *The Gazette* reported:

The state of affairs in Griffintown is such as cause[s] serious anxiety for the condition of the inhabitants of that portion of the city. They are suffering chiefly from want of food and coals; and even those able to buy, can with difficulty obtain these articles, on account of the yards being flooded. The coldness of the weather and the dampness of the rooms where the lower portions of the houses are filled with water, render a fire highly necessary. Accordingly the police authorities are endeavouring to supply to those most in need of it.¹⁷

of stereographs by James Inglis. Those for the snow views state "Taken between the 7th and 15th of March, 1869," and those for the flood views, "Flood in Montreal, 22nd April, 1869."

16 "The Flood," *The Gazette*, 20 April 1869, 1, col. 2.

17 "The Flood," *The Gazette*, 23 April 1869, Local News, 1, col. 3.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the emphasis in Henderson's photographs differs dramatically from that in the newspaper accounts. While sharing a common subject, the substance and rhetorical techniques of each medium are distinctive. The newspapers, only a small portion of whose coverage is quoted here, gathered information about small, often isolated events that were continually changing throughout the city. When read in succession, these accounts formed a disconnected narrative, created contemporaneously with the events, that emphasized an unfolding drama whose outcome was uncertain. The album, although consisting of photographs made at the same time as the events, was assembled and marketed afterwards in a form that constructed a retrospective order on these disparate events. Seen in isolation, each provides fragmentary, partial information, and it is only in moving from one to the other, in seeing what is common and what is not, that one can begin to reconstruct the events of March and April 1869.

DOCUMENTATION AND COMMERCIAL PHOTOGRAPHY

In 1866 or 1867, Alexander Henderson opened his first studio as a commercial portrait and landscape photographer at 10 Phillips Square, Montréal.¹⁸ (He included a partial view of his studio in the photographs of "Phillips Square" in the album; see Fig. 176.) Although he had practised photography as an amateur from 1858, his transition to commercial photography began in the mid-1860s. This entailed establishing a reputation through the successful marketing and promotion of his work.¹⁹

His early reputation was based on his work as a landscape photographer. From the photographs that he had made beginning in 1858, he selected 20 images for publication in 1865 in an album entitled *Canadian Views and Studies by an Amateur*. Each of the 15 surviving copies that have been located contains a slightly different selection of photographs, indicating that the volumes were individually ordered and assembled for each purchaser.²⁰ Starting in 1865, Henderson successfully

18 The biographical information on Henderson is drawn primarily from Stanley G. Triggs, "Alexander Henderson: Nineteenth-Century Landscape Photographer," *Archivaria*, v (1977-78), 45-59, and Louise Guay, "Alexander Henderson, Photographer," *History of Photography*, xiii (1989), 79-94.

19 The methodology of this and the following paragraph is derived from Roger Taylor, *George Washington Wilson: Artist and Photographer, 1823-93* (Aberdeen, 1981), 78-102 and 127-57.

20 Andrew J. Birrell, "The Early Years/1839-1885," in Lily

exhibited individual prints from this body of work internationally (in Dublin in 1865 and Paris in 1867) and locally (at the Art Association of Montreal in 1865 and 1867). In addition, he presented a selection of these images to new members of the Art Association of Montreal in 1865, and two years later he offered three complete sets of *Canadian Views and Studies* as exhibition prizes.²¹ At the same time, Henderson began to market his stereoscopic photographs as individual cards and as half stereoscopic prints in such guide and tourist books as C. R. Chisholm and Company's *The All Round Route Guide*²² and his own *Photographs of Montreal*.²³ Although it is difficult at present to identify the audience Henderson was addressing, the initial evidence would suggest that it was the same affluent art circle for which William Notman worked.²⁴

In choosing to record such a topical event, as he did in *Snow and Flood after Great Storms of 1869*, Henderson adapted his working method to the conditions of a commercial market—conditions that largely determined not only his choice of subject matter but also his marketing strategies and his interpretation. It has become increasingly evident that most nineteenth-century commercial photography operated within strict visual conventions. In such areas as portraiture,²⁵ topographical landscape,²⁶ and architectural representation,²⁷ where a market already flourished, photographers adopted and adapted these conventions to secure part of the market for themselves. An individual photographer's interpretation was cir-

cumscribed by the overriding pressure to produce an image that conformed to the accepted treatment of the chosen subject matter. Henderson photographed the events in stereoscopic form. As was then common, he printed and cropped his negatives in at least three different formats to disperse the work widely throughout the market—as individual stereoscopic cards (Fig. 179), as half stereos for purchase and mounting in personal albums (Fig. 182), and as arranged by Henderson himself in the *Snow and Flood* album (Figs. 178 and 183).

Of even greater importance is the evidence that the album provides of how Henderson's interpretation coincided with that of other commercial photographers. The structure and even point of view of his photographs are virtually identical to other photographers' recording of these same events. This is evident if one compares Henderson's view of McGill Street under snow (Fig. 180) with that of James Inglis (Fig. 181) or to take one further example, Henderson's view of the flooded St. Paul Street (Fig. 183) with that of James Inglis of the same street (Fig. 184). Small differences in the posing of figures or shifts in the camera's position are insignificant in comparison with the remarkable similarities in composition.

Certainly, one reason for these similarities lies in the stereoscopic format itself, in which two slightly different images become fused in viewing into a pronounced three-dimensional effect.²⁸ Photographers commonly sought views that lent themselves to such dramatic effects—a tunnel effect with people set at different points in the receding distance was a common visual device and is frequently found in Henderson's and other photographers' Montréal views (see Figs. 178, 179, 180, and 181).

While the visual properties (even constraints) of stereoscopic photography may account for some similarities at a formal level, the consistency of interpretation found throughout the work of various photographers requires a different explanation. As producers of objects for sale in a commercial market, the photographers recorded and marketed their photographs in a form that was striking without being either threatening or distressing to potential purchasers. In each photograph, the photographer's point of view (which, by implication, became that of the purchaser) was that of a sympathetic but disengaged observer. There is a physical distance, symptomatic of a psychological one, between the photographers and the situations and people shown: after all, the viewer is being asked to participate vicariously in the photo-

Koltun, ed., *Private Realms of Light: Amateur Photography in Canada/1839-1940* (Markham, Ontario, 1984), 6-7.

21 Guay, "Henderson," 81.

22 C. R. Chisholm & Co., ed., *The All Round Route Guide: The Hudson River, Trenton Falls, Niagara, Toronto, the Thousand Islands and the River St. Lawrence, Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec, the Lower St. Lawrence and the Saguenay Rivers, the White Mountains, Boston, New York* (Montreal, 1869).

23 The album contains a printed title page and 20 half stereographs (albumen silver prints) of prominent tourist views of Montréal.

24 See Dennis Reid, "Our Own Country Canada" *Being an Account of the National Aspirations of the Principal Landscape Artists in Montreal and Toronto, 1869-1890* (Ottawa, 1979), 12-62, and Stanley G. Triggs, *William Notman: The Stamp of a Studio* (Toronto, 1985), 23-31.

25 See, for example, my article, "Sketches in Brown: The Portrait Photography of David Octavius Hill and Robert Adamson," in *The Photographs of David Octavius Hill and Robert Adamson*, ex. cat. (Mendel Art Gallery, Saskatoon, 1987), 29-36.

26 See, for example, Grace Seiberling, *Amateurs, Photographers, and the Mid-Victorian Imagination* (Chicago and London, 1986), 46-67.

27 See, for example, Ray McKenzie, "The Cradle and Grave of Empires: Robert Macpherson and the Photography of Nineteenth Century Rome," *The Photographic Collector*, iv (1983), 215-32.

28 See Holmes, "Stereoscope," 56-59.

graphed events and not in the actual events themselves. The resulting emphasis is not upon the physical hardships endured nor the economic dislocations caused by these events, as was a prominent feature in the newspaper accounts, but upon recreating visually the sensations associated with observing and participating in the events from a distance.

DOCUMENTATION AND NINETEENTH-CENTURY PHOTOGRAPHS

Given the conditions and pressures of a commercial market, it is not surprising that Henderson and the other photographers would have responded to and recorded these events in this form. As an instance of documentation, the album reveals as much, possibly more, about the photographer's relation to a market as it does about the subject itself. In turn, our knowledge of the original events becomes correspondingly attenuated.

Henderson's album is by no means unusual, but is representative of prevailing nineteenth-century attitudes towards the use and value of photographs as documentation. In its techniques of representing an event—with the implied psychological distance of the photographer and viewer from that event—the album has affinities with other bodies of documentary work that, at first glance, might seem entirely different in their circumstances and motives. Thomas Annan's record of the slums of central Glasgow, which were scheduled for demolition and urban renewal, was made between 1868 and 1877;²⁹ John Thomson's photographs, to take one further example, that appeared in his and Adolphe Smith's 1877-78 serial publication, *Street Life in London*, was an instance of socially concerned reportage.³⁰ In each of these series of photographs, the photographers have deliberately recorded the inhabitants at a distance. Such a decision (as was also evident in Henderson's album) effectively removes the viewer from a visual confrontation with the harsh conditions that are the photograph's apparent subject. In each instance, the photographers have represented a social situation in a sympathetic but distanced form.

Only in the late 1880s, with the work of Jacob Riis among others, would an appreciable shift in the nature and rhetorical techniques of social documentary photography occur. In Riis's photo-

graphs, such deliberate visually confrontational devices as awkward framing, the use of flash, and direct eye contact were employed to goad a middle-class audience into active political support to change appalling urban conditions.³¹

While this essay has focused on issues of documentation and the sense in which Henderson's photographs can be considered documentary, these concerns were surely not his principal motive in producing this album. A contemporary, topical, and natural disaster provided Henderson (and other Montréal photographers) with the occasion and subject for commercially produced objects. Henderson's interpretation is both consistent with such commercial practices and is representative of more generally held attitudes towards photography in the nineteenth century.

*Centre Canadien d'Architecture/
Canadian Centre for Architecture
1920, rue Baile
Montréal, Québec H3H 2S6*

APPENDIX A

Snow and Flood after Great Storms of 1869

Small octavo album (18.2 × 15.5 cm) of 18 albumen silver prints mounted on linen (each 17.4 × 15.2 cm), with printed title page including list of views. Inscribed on flyleaf with name of owner; numbering of plates also in manuscript. Full green morocco with gilt title (*SNOW & FLOOD/AFTER/GREAT/STORMS/OF/1869*), outside fillets and inside dentelles, and with all edges gilt. Original salmon-coloured end papers.

The plates listed on title page follow. In the measurements, height precedes width. Where noted, figures refer to illustrations in this article.

1. *Engines clearing the track, G.T.R.*, 11.2 × 8.9 cm (Fig. 174)
2. *Great St. James Street*, 11.7 × 8.9 cm (Fig. 178)
3. *Bank of Montreal*, 11.0 × 8.9 cm
4. *Recollet Street*, 11.3 × 8.8 cm
5. *McGill Street, looking upwards*, 10.9 × 8.9 cm (Fig. 180)
6. *Beaver Hall*, 11.2 × 8.9 cm (Fig. 175)
7. *Phillips Square*, 11.3 × 8.9 cm (Fig. 176)
8. *High School*, 11.8 × 8.9 cm
9. *Sherbrooke St. near Bleury Street*, 11.2 × 9.0 cm
10. *St. Catherine Street*, 11.3 × 8.9 cm
11. *Wellington Terrace*, 11.8 × 8.9 cm
12. *Corner Metcalfe & St. Catherine St.*, 11.3 × 8.9 cm
13. *Upper University Street*, 11.8 × 8.9 cm
14. *Near Côte-des-Neiges*, 11.2 × 8.9 cm
15. *Spring Flood in McGill Street*, 10.1 × 8.9 cm (Fig. 177)
16. *St. Paul Street, in flood*, 11.3 × 8.9 cm (Fig. 183)
17. *William Street, in flood*, 11.3 × 8.8 cm
18. *Custom House Square, in flood*, 11.0 × 8.9 cm

29 See Thomas Annan, *Photographs of the Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow 1868/1877*, with an introduction by Anita V. Mozley (New York, 1977).

30 See John Thomson and Adolphe Smith, *Street Life in London* (1878; rpt. New York, 1969). On John Thomson, see Stephen White, *John Thomson: Life and Photographs* (London, 1985).

31 See Peter Bacon Hales, *Silver Cities: The Photography of American Urbanization, 1839-1915* (Philadelphia, 1984), 161-217, and Stange, *Symbols*, 1-46.



FIGURE 174. Alexander Henderson, Press Castle, Scotland, 1831-Montréal, 1913, Active, Canada, *Engines clearing the track, G.T.R.*, albumen silver print from wet-collodion glass-plate negative, 1869, 11.2 × 8.9 cm, plate 1 from *Snow and Flood After Great Storms of 1869* (Montreal: Alexander Henderson, 1869). PH1981:1285:001, Collection Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal.



FIGURE 175. Alexander Henderson, Press Castle, Scotland, 1831-Montréal, 1913, Active, Canada, *Beaver Hall, Montreal*, albumen silver print from wet-collodion glass-plate negative, March 1869, 11.2 × 8.9 cm, plate 6 from *Snow and Flood After Great Storms of 1869* (Montreal: Alexander Henderson, 1869). PH1981:1285:006, Collection Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal.



FIGURE 176. Alexander Henderson, Press Castle, Scotland, 1831-Montréal, 1913, Active, Canada, *Phillips Square, Montreal*, albumen silver print from wet-collodion glass-plate negative, March 1869, 11.3 × 8.9 cm, plate 7 from *Snow and Flood After Great Storms of 1869* (Montreal: Alexander Henderson, 1869). PH1981:1285:007, Collection Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal.



FIGURE 177. Alexander Henderson, Press Castle, Scotland, 1831-Montréal, 1913, Active, Canada, *Spring Flood in McGill Street, Montreal*, albumen silver print from wet-collodion glass-plate negative, April 1869, 10.1 × 8.9 cm, plate 15 from *Snow and Flood After Great Storms of 1869* (Montreal: Alexander Henderson, 1869). PH1981:1285:015, Collection Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal.



FIGURE 178. Alexander Henderson, Press Castle, Scotland, 1831-Montréal, 1913, Active, Canada, *Great St. James Street, Montreal*, albumen silver print from wet-collodion glass-plate negative, March 1869, 11.7 × 8.9 cm, plate 2 from *Snow and Flood After Great Storms of 1869* (Montreal: Alexander Henderson, 1869). PH1981:1285:002, Collection Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal.



FIGURE 179. Alexander Henderson, Press Castle, Scotland, 1831-Montréal, 1913, Active, Canada, *St. James Street, Montreal*, stereograph (two albumen silver prints from wet-collodion glass-plate negative), March 1869, 7.9 × 7.5 cm (each image). Collection David Miller, Montréal.



FIGURE 180. Alexander Henderson, Press Castle, Scotland, 1831-Montréal, 1913, Active, Canada, *McGill Street, Looking Upwards, Montreal*, albumen silver print from wet-collodion glass-plate negative, March 1869, 10.9 × 8.9 cm, plate 5 from *Snow and Flood After Great Storms of 1869* (Montreal: Alexander Henderson, 1869). PH1981:1285:005, Collection Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal.



FIGURE 181. James Inglis, Scotland, 1835-Chicago, 1904, Active, Canada and the United States, *McGill Street, Montreal*, stereograph (two albumen silver prints from a wet-collodion glass-plate negative), March 1869, 7.8 × 7.7 cm (each image). Collection David Miller, Montréal.



Flood in Montreal

FIGURE 182. Alexander Henderson, Press Castle, Scotland, 1831-Montréal, 1913, Active, Canada, *Flood in Montreal* (St. Paul Street), albumen silver print from wet-collodion glass-plate negative, April 1869, 7.7 × 7.3 cm, unnumbered plate in an album owned by General Thomas J. Grant. Collection National Archives of Canada, C10977.



FIGURE 183. Alexander Henderson, Press Castle, Scotland, 1831-Montréal, 1913, Active, Canada, *St. Paul Street, in Flood, Montreal*, albumen silver print from wet-collodion glass-plate negative, April 1869, 11.3 × 8.9 cm. plate 16 from *Snow and Flood After Great Storms of 1869* (Montreal: Alexander Henderson, 1869). PH1981:1285:016. Collection Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal.



FIGURE 184. James Inglis, Scotland, 1835-Chicago, 1904, *Active, Canada and the United States, St. Paul Street, Montreal*, stereograph (two albumen silver prints from a wet-collodion glass-plate negative), 22 April 1869, 7.7 × 7.9 cm (each image). SV1978:0010, Collection Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal.